

11. The zoologically and nomenclaturally correct conclusion is that the type-species of *Phasia* Latreille is typical *subcoleoprata* Linnaeus. This has been adopted without difficulty in important recent works on the group. The proposal to use the plenary powers to designate *rubra* Girschner as type-species should be rejected as unfounded and unnecessary.

## REFERENCES

- BROOKS, A. R. 1945. A revision of the North American species of the *Phasia* complex (Diptera, Tachinidae). *Scientific Agric.* 25 : 647-679  
 FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema entomologiae*. 832 pp. (*subcoleopratus*, 764)  
 — 1794. *Entomologia systematica emendata et aucta*. Vol. 4, 472 pp. (*subcoleopratus*, 283)  
 — 1805. *Systema antliatorum*. 372 pp. (*subcoleoprata*, 217)  
 LATREILLE, P. A. 1810. *Considérations générales sur l'ordre naturel des animaux* . . . 444 pp. (*Phasia*, type designation, p. 444)  
 LINNAEUS, C. 1767. *Systema naturae* (ed. 12). Vol. 1 (part 2): 533-1327 (*subcoleoprata*, 1006)  
 SABROSKY, C. W. and ARNAUD, P. H., Jr. 1965. Tachinidae, in STONE et al., *A catalog of the Diptera of America north of Mexico*. 1696 pp. (*Phasia*, p. 969)

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR  
*PROSPALTELLA* ASHMEAD, 1904. Z.N.(S.) 1713  
 (see volume 22, pages 261-262)

By B. D. Burks (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

I favor this action, because it will validate preponderant usage all over the world for a period of 60 years. There is now an enormous literature using the name *Prospaltella* in the sense of the type-species *aurantii* (Howard), a cosmopolitan species. The comprehensive paper that Howard published in 1907 (U.S.D.A., Bureau of Entomology Tech. Ser. 12, pt. 4, "New genera and species of Aphelinidae with a revised table of genera") in which the type-species was given as *aurantii* established usage throughout the world. The species *murtfeldtae* (Howard) that had been clearly designated type-species in 1894 is one that occurs only in North America, it is rather rare, and it is unknown to most workers. It would be a mistake to invoke priority at this late date and rename *Prospaltella* Howard of 1907. I have long known that this discrepancy between usage and priority existed for *Prospaltella*, but I rather thought the matter would never be brought up, the actual type-species being conveniently obscure. Now that the discrepancy has been made the subject of a proposal for action by the Commission under their plenary powers, I can only express myself as being in favor of it.

COMMENTS ON THE REQUEST FOR A DECLARATION AGAINST THE  
 SUPPRESSION OF *NOMINA DUBIA*. Z.N.(S.) 1715  
 (see volume 22, pages 265-266)

By W. D. L. Ride (*Western Australian Museum, Perth*)

I agree with the disquiet expressed by Commissioner Sabrosky over a number of recent applications for the suppression of names for the reason that they are *nomina dubia*. But I am far from convinced that a formal Declaration is warranted or even desirable. The term *nomen dubium* has no formal status in nomenclature and the qualification of a name by this term requires no consequences through the Code; moreover, it is not one of the conditions under which the use of the plenary powers is authorized. It follows, therefore, that without fundamental modification of the Code the Secretary can inform applicants for the suppression of *nomina dubia* (on those